

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 16 and 17 are amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Garland during the personal interview held April 19, 2006, are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Applicant gratefully appreciates the indication of claims 4, 7-10, 12-13, 16 and 18 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the recitation of "the measured amount" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 16 is amended to overcome the rejection. Moreover, with respect to claim 7, Applicant respectfully points out that the recitation of "a measured amount" does provide a clear antecedent basis for the later recitation of "the measured amount". Thus, claims 7 and 16 now fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Collins (U.S. Patent No. 6,814,814); and claims 5-6, 11, 14-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Collins. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Collins fails to disclose or suggest a method for managing semiconductor manufacturing equipment that includes selecting a first process to be performed on a semiconductor substrate, selecting a second process to be performed on a same or another semiconductor substrate wherein the second process is for manufacturing the same or another semiconductor substrate as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 11 and 17.

Collins teaches a method of cleaning process residues formed on surfaces in a substrate processing chamber, wherein a sacrificial substrate comprising the sacrificial material is placed in the chamber (Abstract). As discussed during the personal interview with Examiner Garland, Collins teaches that the second process, i.e., the cleaning process, results in the destruction of the sacrificial substrate, and is not a process for manufacturing the sacrificial substrate, as recited in the independent claims. Because the sacrificial substrate is being destroyed during the cleaning process, the sacrificial substrate is not being manufactured in the chamber.

For at least these reasons, Collins fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 17. Thus, independent claims 1, 11 and 17, and their dependent claims are patentable over Collins. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

JAO/TMN:amw

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 8, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
